# 01174

1962/11/14

 [Richard Lehman], Excerpt from Memorandum for Director of Central Intelligence, "CIA Handling of the Soviet Buildup in Cuba," 14 November 1962 (Excerpt)

## TOP SECRET

## K. The Targeting of San Cristobal

- do. Although the sites themselves were closed to ground enveration; the movement of equipment to them from the ports was in fact seen by CIA agents and by a number of individuals who later fled to the US. The agents reported this information as soon as they were able, but in most cases had to depend on secret writing for communication. Hence, there was also of several days at least before their information became available. Refugee reports were delayed considerably longer for other, and uncontrollable, reasons—the time of the Lindividual's decision to leave Cuba, his discovery of means for dividual's decision to leave Cuba, his discovery of means for dividual's on the interrogation center. Many of the reports so received dealt with unidentifiable construction activity. Many of them, because of the time-lags noted above, did not arrive in Washington until after 14 October, and some are still coming in.
- 41. Nevertheless by about 1 october, the San Cristobal area had been pipooter as a suspect MEMB site and photographic confirmation in pipooter as a suspect MEMB site and photographic properties of the pipooter and pipoote
- 42. On 15 February 1962 an interagency interrogation center was established by CIA at Opa Locka, near Miami, to handle Cuban refugees: and improve the quality of intelligence collected from them. It was manned by trained bilingual, interrogators from the armed services and CIA. The establishment of Opa Locka coincided with a sharp drop in reports of missile activity received in Washington. When the defensive phase of the Soviet buildup began, the volume of Opa Locka reporting ross very rapidly, and provided good information on the types of equipment coming in, on the use of Soviet personnel and on the security precautions imposed by the Soviets on this operation. (Such reports were the basis for the Checklist item cited in para 9).

-23-

# TOP-SECRET

- 43. For the better part of two years, CIA had been checking information obtained from refuge, defector, and agent sources with NPIC whenever it was apparent that the formation was of a kind that could be verified or a greated by serial recomaissance. In May 1962, NPIC began published serial formal listings (Photographic Evaluation of Information Coch) in which these reports were evaluated in the light of pactographic public coverage. In the 7 issues of this publication between 31 May and 5 October NPIC examined 138 raw reports referred to it for comment. Of this total, only three cited missile activity which could not be linked directly to the SA-2 and cruise missile deployments. NPIC's evidence negated those three.
- 44. When the first indications of build-up began to come in flaugust, whese procedures were further tightened. CIA current intelligence was ordered orally by the DD/I's office on about 14 August not to publish any information on the construction of missile bases in Cuba until they had been checked out with NPIC. (This instruction was in the field of intelligence technique rather than of policy; it had no relation to later restrictions; (see para 50). Between 14 August and mid-October this office sent NPIC 13 memoranda asking for a check on 25 separate reports containing information which was thought to raise the possibility of Soviet offensive weapons in Cubal A great many more such reports were checked with NPIC informally by telephone. In all cases, NPIC either lacked the necessary coverage or made a negative finding.
- 45. On 20 August, the COMOR Targeting Working Group (chaired and staffed largely by CLA) set up the first comprehensive card file system for Cuban targets. An example of its procedures is the handling of targets in the Sagua La Grande area. Based on refugee reporting, the COMOR Targeting Working Group on 27 August pinpointed four farms in this area as suspect missite sites. Readout of the 29 August coverage showed an SA-2 site near Sagua La Grande which apparently was the hasis an SA-2 site near Sagua La Grande which apparently was the hasis to have a confirmed SA-2 site. It is the target card was changed to show a confirmed SA-2 site. It is the same could have led analysts to misinterpret any subsequent reports of MRBM activity as part of the SAM development, but in fact no such reports were received.
- 46. By September, the volume of agent and refugee reporting had become very large indeed. During the month 862 reports on internal activities in Cuba were disseminated, exclusive of telegraphic dissemination, (The CIA clandestine collectors report that their output represented only the small publishable fraction of the raw material collected.) A substantial



(:



proportion of these dealt with the deployment of defensive misstles and related activities. Knowledge on the pant of the analysts that such a deployment was in fact going on, plus the normal difficulties encountered by untrained observers in telling an offensive missile from a defensive one, tended to throw a sort of smoke-screen around the Soviet offensive deployment when it finally began. The CIA analytic apparatus, however, recognized and correlated the first authentic reports of MBBW equipment ever to be received in Washington, and took action upon them. It targeted the San Cristobal area, not as another location where alleged missile activity should be negated by photography, but as a suspect SS-4 site.

- 47. This process took about three weeks, from the date when the first observation was made on the ground in Cuba to the preparation of the target card. The two reports from Opa Locka which triggered it were:
- a. An observation in Havana on 12 September of a convoy carrying: long canvas-covered objects which the source identified under interrogation as resembling SS-4s. This report, which was disseminated by CIA on 21 September, contained sufficient accurate detail to alleri intelligence analysis.
- b. An observation on 17 September of a compay moving toward the San Cristohal area. This information, received on 27 September, dovetailed in many respects with the earlier report.
- 48. The arrival of the second report led CIA analysts to a tentative conclusion that the two observers had in fact seen the same convoy, and that there was a possibility of the SS-4 identification being genuine. A day or so earlier, a. target card on San Cristobal had been prepared on the basis of a vague report of "Russians building a rocket base." Now this card was removed and, with the two reports cited above and other less specific information on activity in this area which was beginning to trickle in, a new card was prepared between 1 and 3 October which was in effect a priority requirement for photographic coverage. This card was used in the targeting of the 14 October flight (see para 63). It read as follows: "Collateral reports indicate the existence of a restricted area in Pinar del Rio Province which is suspected of including an SSM site under construction, particularly SS-4 Styster. The area is bounded by a line connecting the following four town: Consolidation del Norte (832M/22447); San Diego del Los Banos (8325M/2235W); San Cristobal (8311M/22437); and Las Pozos (8317N/2250W). Requirement: Search the area delineated for possible surface missile construction, with particular attention to SS-4 Shyster."



# TOP DECRET

49. Another report, too general to be used in the process described above, is nevertheless of interest as the first good information distributed on the Soviet offensive build-up. On 20 September, CIA disseminated a report that Castro's personal pilot, Claudio Morinas, had said on 9 September "We have 40-mile range guided missiles, both surface-to-surface and surface-to-air, and we have a radar system which covers, sector by sector, all of the Cuban air space and (beyond) as far as Florida. There are also many mobile ramps for intermediate range rockets"

-26-

The Cubon Missele Crisis Revisited UM 2005

١		2	<b>હ</b>	4	S	6	7	8	9	/0	//	12	13	14
A	(a)		1/5	7	E.	}	3	Ų	ζ,	ķ	7.	8.	7	/b
В	ħ	Y	13	14	15 :	16	17	18	ſì	70	31	X	>	(
C	1/1/6	·		7	3	4.	5	li	Y		7	<	7	<
D	1/1	X	(3)	X		1		K		X		*	7	
E	1/8	X	الأراب به الإراب به الإراب	X	•	K	\	Κ.		<b>X</b>	ħ	X		X
F	197	1	(3)	X 7	`	X		X	,	X	\	X		X
6	1/80	X	(SP)	7	3	X		X	\ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \	X		X		K

The Cuban Missile Crisis Revisited: An International Collection of Documents, from the Bay of Pigs to the Brink of Nuclear War

Published by: ProQuest Information and Learning, 300 North Zeeb Rd., PO Box 1346, Ann Arbor, MI 48106, USA

The Cuban Missile Crisis Revisited: An International Collection of Documents, from the Bay of Pigs to the Brink of Nuclear War reproduces a comprehensive collection of records from the archives of the three key governments involved in the most dangerous confrontation of the Cold war. Declassified records from the United States, Russia and Cuba significantly advance analysis of the historical foundations of the missile crisis, the policy calculations and considerations of President John F. Kennedy and premiers Nikita Khrushchev and Fidel Castro, and the overt and covert military and paramilitary operations that combined to bring the world to the threshold of a nuclear exchange. Topics extensively covered in the documentation include the failed U.S.-led invasion at the Bay of Pigs, renewed attempts to overthrow Castro through Operation Mongoose and Operation Northwoods, U.S. military contingency planning for conflict with Cuba, naval warfare, Soviet and Cuban decision making and communications during the crisis, and the repercussions for U.S.-Soviet relations, and Soviet-Cuban relations in its aftermath. Materials were identified, obtained, assembled and indexed by the National Security Archive, a non-profit Washington D.C. based research institute and library. The microfiche collection is accompanied by a printed guide and index.

### Arrangement of Information on the Microfiche:

The documents are arranged in chronological order within classes of documents. A unique identification number is assigned to each document. Each new document begins a new line on the microfiche.

## Microfiche Numbering:

The unique identification numbers assigned to the documents are listed in the top right-hand corner of the microfiche header.

#### Technical Data:

Date of Publication of Microfiche Edition: 2006
Format: 49 double frame, 105mm x 148mm microfiche
24 x nominal reduction

#### Copyright:

This finding aid is in copyright and reproduction of individual pages for purposes other than for private study may not be made without permission from the holding institution.

Arrangement ©2006 ProQuest Information and Learning Company. All rights reserved.

#### Distribution Outside the USA

ProQuest Information and Learning, The Quorum, Barnwell Road, Cambridge CB5 8SW, England

